DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 693 HE 013 177

AUTHOR Duchastel, Philippe; Harrison, Roger
TITLE Introducing New Faculty Members to Course Production. An Induction Program in the Faculty of Technology.
INSTITUTION Open Univ., Walton, Bletchley, Bucks (England). Inst. of Educational Technology.
PUB DATE Dec 77
NOTE 26p.
AVAILABLE FROM Open University, Institute of Educational Technology, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes MK7 6AA, England

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Course Descriptions; *Course Organization; Curriculum Development; Educational Objectives; Educational Technology; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Open Universities; *Orientation Materials; *Teacher Orientation; *Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS *Open University (Great Britain)

ABSTRACT

An induction program set up by the Institute of Educational Technology at the Open University (England) in 1977 for new members of the technology faculty is described and evaluated. Two principles were followed in the program: (1) documentation should be carefully selected so as not to overload the participants; and activity-based experiences are preferable to passive assimilation of ideas. It was set up to run over a few months rather than be an intensive session at the beginning of the faculty member's appointment. Program activities are outlined and the phases discussed. Workshops were offered in course unit writing, objectives and assessment, and course design. Participants were interviewed for their reactions to the program. The overall impression was that it was successful, and although some activities appeared more valuable than others, all activities were of some value to someone. The timing was felt to be inappropriate to some. Most participants felt that other faculty should have such programs. Specific suggestions for improvement, and recommendations for future induction programs, are provided. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Institute of Educational Technology
The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes MK7 6AA
Telephone (0908) 63546

COURSE DEVELOPMENT GROUP

HE

ED192693

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Open University

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INTRODUCING NEW FACULTY MEMBERS TO COURSE PRODUCTION

An Induction Program in the Faculty of Technology

Philippe Duchastel
and
Roger Harrison

ABSTRACT

The principal aim of this paper is to describe an induction programme set up by IET for new members of the Technology Faculty in the autumn of 1977 and to offer an evaluation of the experience. The memos which activated and directed the programme are inserted throughout the document; these not only give the flavour of the activity but also describe it in the kind of detail which may be useful to others involved with similar concerns in the future.

HE013 177

INTRODUCING NEW FACULTY MEMBERS TO COURSE PRODUCTION

An Induction Programme in the Faculty of Technology.

Philippe Duchastel

and

Roger Harrison

Institute of Educational Technology
The Open University

AUTUMN 1977

AUG 2 5 1980

Introduction

The principal aim of this paper is to describe an induction programme set up by IET for new members of the Technology Faculty in the autumn of 1977 and to offer an evaluation of the experience. The memos which activated and directed the programme are inserted throughout the document; these not only give the flavour of the activity but also describe it in the kind of detail which may be useful to others involved with similar concerns in the future.

The idea of an induction programme was suggested by Roger Harrison when he realised that eleven new lecturers would be taking up post in the Technology Faculty in September 1977. The numbers involved presented a worthwhile opportunity to set up a formal induction programme which would introduce the new lecturers to the University and especially to educational technology, ie to the practice of good course production.

The idea of a formal induction programme (proposed in June) was well received in the Faculty, with the proviso that experienced faculty members should play a major role in the programme. In other words, an all-IET programme was to be avoided.

Planning for the programme got under way in early June when a first proposal was circulated for comment. In July, a second member of IET (Philippe Duchastel) became involved and the views of individual heads of discipline in the Faculty were sought. Review of previous efforts in this area provided further insights and a general philosophy of induction evolved which is described in the following section.

The programme itself was offered in September and October 1977 to ten academics (one appointment had yet to be made).

Generally speaking, the programme was felt to be a success by those involved, despite some short-comings. Evaluation of the programme is taken up in a further section.

Rationale of the programme

The assumptions underlying the programme are made explicit in the memo appearing on pp.3-4; this memo was sent to heads of disciplines for comment, along with the contact sheet and an early version of the programme itself (which was very similar to the final programme).

Two essential ideas were taken up from previous experience with induction in IET (induction of IET members in 1975 and a short course for Iranian students in 1976). These were that (i) documentation should be carefully selected so as not to overload the participants; and (ii) activity-based experiences are preferable to passive assimilation of ideas.

A further principle, that of optional participation, pervaded the programme. The reason for adopting this principle was twofold: firstly, the backgrounds of the new lecturers were very varied (some were already very familiar with the OU, others not; some had previous teaching experience, some not; etc.). Secondly, it was felt by us that the programme should be inherently interesting and not require coercion of any kind, otherwise it would be failing; after all, we were dealing with mature individuals who can decide for themselves how to establish their priorities. This however, caused difficulties which were not foreseen at the time and is discussed below.

Also, as made clear in a further memo to the mentors (one named in each discipline), the induction programme was intended to be a joint affair between IET and the Faculty. It was not meant to cut across the responsibility of each discipline towards its new staff members with respect to developing the attitudes and competencies appropriate to work at the OU. The programme was aimed at assisting with this process, not at taking it over altogether.

A further planning assumption was that the programme should be run over a period of a few months rather than constitute an intensive full-time experience at the very beginning of one's appointment. Simply settling in to a new

PROPOSED PROGRAM

Introduction

The induction program is being prepared and co-ordinated by Philippe Duchastel (IET) although responsibility for its design and operation rests with the Faculty and IET together. A number of people from various areas of the university are involved, either directly or indirectly, and their names appear on the document entitled CONTACTS which is appended.

The New Academic Staff

Of the eleven new Lecturers who will be joining the academic staff this autumn, all except one take up their post on the 1st of September. (Dr. Jones will be taking up his post on the 1st of October). It is also worth noting that Mr. Forrester-Paton and Dr. Stiny are already working in the Faculty as Research Fellows and are therefore somewhat more familiar already with the OU system than the others are likely to be.

Basis of the Proposed Program

The proposed program (which is appended) is designed to fit in fairly loosely with the plan of work which each new member of staff will be setting up for himself in consultation with the head of his discipline. The program was designed with the following considerations in mind:

A. We should aim for a minimal provision in the first instance, while offering the opportunity for more later on (upon request).

B. The most prevalent pitfall of induction programs is overload of information; cramming in of induction experiences should be avoided in the early stages, thus letting the new lecturers adapt quite naturally to the OU and the Faculty. The program should be drawn out over a number of months, being intertwined with regular work.

C. All activities in the program should be fully optional, although preparatory work for specific workshops will be required of those wishing to attend them.

D. The new lecturers will come to the OU with their own educational values and beliefs and experience; this needs to be constantly recognized and valued and lead to an open-ended approach to educational technology rather than a strictly prescriptive one.

E. Of particular value will be small group meetings between the new lecturers and more experienced staff in the Faculty.

F. The program would be better appreciated if active and job-oriented and if it relies on reading only where necessary.

G. Finally, it is worth remembering that the new staff have a mind of their own and it will be up to them to eventually guide us to their own specific needs.

Structure of the Program

The program will be co-ordinated through IET, although the greatest benefits are expected to come directly from the experienced Faculty members whom the new lecturers will be in contact with.

Each discipline is expected to name one of its experienced members to assist its new lecturers, not only in settling in, but also in developing the educational attitudes and competences to deal with their work. The induction program itself is only meant to structure and assist this process.

The program consists of suggested readings and activities, visits and meetings, specified collective tasks and workshops. An initial draft of the proposed program is appended.

Finalizing the Program

If we are to be ready in early September, it will be necessary to finalize the program pretty soon. I therefore ask all of those who are involved in the program (or feel responsible for it) to suggest improvements or modifications, if they wish to do so, before August 15th if at all possible. I would also be pleased to hear your feelings about the program next time we meet.

Cordially,

P. Duchastel P. Duchastel

TECHNOLOGY FACULTY INDUCTION PROGRAM

AUTUMN 1977

CONTACTS

Coordinator	Philippe Duchastel, IET (3781/3141)
IET	Roger Harrison (3538/3141)
Faculty	Andrew Spackman (3941)
Disciplines:	
Systems	John Martin (3759)
Design	Professor Lionel March (3382)
Electronics	Gaby Smol (3270)
Mechanics	Keith Attenborough (3945)
Materials	Professor Charles Newey (3271)
BBC	Nat Taylor (414)
Personnel	Chris Row (3236)
Information Services	Rosemary Seymour (3636)

New Faculty Members:

Systems:	J. Hamwee
	R. Forrester-Paton
Materials:	A. Demaid
Electronics:	A.W. Jones
	A. Redish
Design:	P. Steadman
	G. Stiny
Mechanics:	A. Bright
	M.A. Dorgham
	D. Dixon

TECHNOLOGY FACULTY INDUCTION PROGRAM

AUTUMN 1977

Most meetings will take place in Room N-2018 in the Science and Technology Building.

September 5:	Introduction to the Open University 11.00 a.m.: Introduction to the Induction Program 11.30 a.m.: Horizon Film on the OU (50 mins) 2.00 p.m.: Tour of the OU with Rosie Seymour (40-60 mins)
September 6:	Introduction to the Faculty 2.30 p.m.: What's what in the Faculty - a talk by Andrew Spackman (1 hour or so)
September 7-19:	Working through Units 33-4 from T100, "Design" and Unit 12 from TS251, "Car Body I" in preparation for the Workshop on Unit Writing
September 17 (Saturday):	Open University Open Day
September 19:	Workshop on Unit Writing 11.00 a.m.: Confronting one's own views with those of experienced staff (1½ hours or so)
September 27:	Regular USS Level Induction Program offered by Personnel. 9.15 a.m.: Details to follow (all day)
September 28:	Workshop on Objectives and Assessment 11.00 a.m.: As for previous workshop (with same sets of units) - Preparation during previous week
October 3:	Workshop on Course Design 11.00 a.m.: Topics will include use of broadcasting, project work, ...
October 10:	Visit to the BBC 11.00 a.m.: What goes on at Alexandra Palace (all day)
October 17:	Visit to a Region 4.00 p.m.: Meet the people at Region X 7.00 p.m.: Visit Study Centre Y and sit in on ongoing tutorial sessions
October 24	Brief Walton Hall visits 9.00 a.m.: Project Control 10.00 a.m.: Media Graphics 11.00 a.m.: Editors 2.00 p.m.: IET 3.00 p.m.: Student Computing Service 4.00 p.m.: Library
October 31:	Open Seminar 11.00 a.m.: Topic to be suggested by the new Faculty members

---

Throughout September	Visits to various Course Team meetings

Internal Memorandum

From Philippe Duchastel

To Discipline Mentors

Subject Induction of new staff members in your discipline

Date 12 August 1977

Please find attached the induction program which I am proposing, along with Roger Harrison, in order to enable the new staff members arriving in September to get the most out of their first few months with us.

I have spoken to each of you about our general intentions and you have agreed to act as the person in your discipline who is responsible for helping the new people settle in, both practically and academically. As you will see from the attached sheets, the induction program is only meant to supplement your own personal program and not to replace it. It will be up to you to suggest which academic activities the new people get involved in and to provide them with feedback on their first efforts.

Other than the meetings and visits indicated on the induction program (which are all optional, by the way) the only other time requirement which will be expected of the new people is the time necessary to prepare for the three workshops (which amounts to thoroughly going through a pair of units, yet to be selected).

We will also be preparing a package of resource materials (chosen from previous induction programs, etc) which will be sent to you and which the new people may consult as they wish.

In terminating, here are a few pearls of wisdom derived from previous experience (not my own, unfortunately) with induction programs. Do with them what you will.

- Remember when you first arrived here! How did it feel?
- The people under your responsibility may be afraid of wasting your time (a common fear), so reassure them in this respect.
- Beware of sending them off to meet crabby and cynical types.
- Beware of offloading chores on the new staff.
- Feel responsible for providing feedback if it is at all wanted (go to them - don't wait for them to come to you).
- If possible, provide specific tasks for them to engage in, tasks which are useful and which provide insights into course team work.

Please feel free to comment on and suggest changes to the induction program which is attached.

Philippe Duchastel

environment (at work and at home for many) was felt to constitute an unusual situation with its own demands and rather likely to conflict with the concentration expected in an intensive and brief programme. It was also hoped that the induction programme could eventually simply mutate into an ongoing series of seminars centred on educational issues of relevance to both new and more experienced staff members.

The rationale and the programme itself were approved by the discipline mentors, after a few changes of a minor nature. The programme therefore got under way in the second half of August with a pre-mailing of selected material.

Operation of the programme

The programme itself (cf. p.6) can be thought of consisting of four phases, as follows:

1. A pre-programme phase, consisting of printed material sent to the future lecturers in August.
2. A phase consisting of a general introduction to the OU, covered especially by the first two days of the programme, but also by the 17 and 27 September activities.
3. A workshop phase, covering pertinent aspects of educational technology and being the focus for the first month of the programme.
4. A visits phase, occurring during the second month of the programme.

Additionally, throughout the programme group members were encouraged to sit-in on course team meetings in the Faculty.

Pre-programme phase. It was felt that most future lecturers would have some free time in August to do some reading related to their future work and that interest to do so was likely to be high. It was initially planned therefore to

send them two sets of material: (i) the OU Information Service's introductory booklet on the OU, along with associated general leaflets; and (ii) some introductory material on what was considered a crucial concept in quality teaching at the university level: the concept of learning objectives. As it turned out, only the first set of materials was sent out, as difficulties were experienced in finding appropriate materials related to the second concern. There just does not seem to be an introduction to learning objectives which can stand on its own and yet show strong face validity in relation to higher education (as opposed to school learning and training). And it would have been disastrous to send out something which made a fool of the concept. It was therefore dropped, although with regret.

General introduction phase. It was hoped initially that the one-day programme offered by Personnel could be arranged specially at the beginning of the month for the new Technology lecturers. This, however, was not feasible, so our own introduction to the OU, based on a documentary film and a tour of the facilities, was arranged in conjunction with Information Services. As new members of the University, the individuals in the programme were also invited later on (27 September) to Personnel's own one-day programme. It was also fortunate that the yearly University Open Day was held this year in mid-September, thus enabling our group members to see various exhibits organised by numerous units in the OU.

Towards the beginning of the programme, an informal talk by the administrative assistant to the Faculty introduced the group members to both the workings of the Faculty and its current concerns. This also dealt with minor practical matters which new members have eventually to learn about, such as travel reimbursement, etc. This meeting was felt to be especially useful, as indicated by the fact that it went on for nearly three hours, although we had only planned it for an hour or so.

Only five of the new lecturers came to the introductory meeting on 5 September and only four on the sixth. Why so few? The reasons seem manifold. Firstly, one

member was not due to arrive until 1 October, another not until 1 January, while still another appointment remained to be made. Secondly, three members had actually been with the OU for three to eighteen months, two of these had been involved with research rather than teaching, while the third had actually already written a few units for a course and made some television programmes as well. Thus, while all members of the group were new appointees, they were not by any means all new to the OU or to its teaching methods.

The three members of the group who had been at the OU for some time actually did not participate at all in the programme, except for one who came to one of the workshops. They felt little need for any kind of induction, as related later in the evaluation interviews.

As we shall see, however, attendance at certain sessions was bolstered by other new members of staff who were involved in part-time or temporary work for the OU.

Workshop phase. There were three workshops planned for the induction programme, one on unit writing, one on objectives and assessment, and one on various aspects of course design. Each workshop involved essential preparation related to the workshop. Two weeks' preparation time was accorded the first workshop and one week for each of the other two.

The intent of the workshops was to create a situation in which different views on an issue or on a given practice would gently confront each other and lead the participants to consider the issues in a deeper way than previously. We were careful to avoid engendering the directive teaching approach, which often occurs in similar situations. The participating mentors from the disciplines were strongly invited to join the workshops and on each instance two or three of them did so.

The first workshop (cf. the memo on p.12) involved a somewhat lengthy preparation, as the group members had to analyse the equivalent of two full units.

This first workshop was aimed at discovering which positive and which negative aspects of OU teaching practice could be derived from the two units in question. The units had been initially suggested to us during our interviews with the heads of discipline earlier in the summer. They were selected by us because (i) they were easily read (no strong prerequisites); (ii) they contained what we considered ourselves to be various good and various bad aspects, and (iii) they formed a useful contrast in terms of teaching style (one was "soft" in teaching, the other was harder).

The further resources listed in the memo were meant not as primary reading material, but rather as a file to be dipped into according to need and interest. Our intent was to get the group members and the mentors (and ourselves as well) to conduct a more-than-superficial analysis of the two units selected for the workshop and not to get bogged down in the reading of lengthy secondary material. We made this intention clear and provided each discipline with only one full set of readings, as listed on the memo, thus forcing their consideration as a file rather than as necessary reading. This did seem to have the desired effect.

The workshop was attended by four group members, two mentors and ourselves. The meeting was planned to begin with the views of one of the mentors, then go to the views of the group members and finally to the views of the rest of us, before getting involved with a general discussion. As it turned out, however, the meeting was somewhat impossible to manage as many had rather strong views which at times conflicted with those of others. There was a great amount of discussion engendered and the meeting was felt generally to have been a success. One difficulty encountered was the constant desire to become involved in content issues (ie what was taught) rather than to stick with pedagogical issues as planned (how it was taught). It was often difficult to steer the discussion along these lines.

While it is true that consideration of a single unit could have filled the whole session, it was felt that consideration of the two selected units was a good

TECHNOLOGY FACULTY INDUCTION PROGRAM

AUTUMN 1977

WORKSHOP ON UNIT WRITING

Essential Preparation:

Critique of the following units:

- T100 Units 33-4, "Design" (Sections 3 and 4 excepted)
- TS251 Unit 12, "Car Body I"

Your task is not only to read these units but to analyse them as teaching documents (in as much detail as you can).

Further Resources:

Optional consultation of the following papers:

• Beryl Crooks	Writing a Unit
• Roger Harrison	Planning and Writing a Unit
• Roger Harrison	What are the characteristics of good course material
• _____	Notes for Authors - Industrial Relations Course
• Kay Pole	DE206 Guide to Course Unit Writing
• Judith Riley	To maximise learning pay-off from your work preparing units.

Philippe Duchastel
September 1977

WORKSHOP ON OBJECTIVES AND ASSESSMENT

Essential Preparation:

- Consideration of the role played by objectives in an instructional text, with reference to the two units examined in the Unit Writing Workshop.

- Analysis of the following assignments:

  - T100 TMA 07 Question 1 (Design) only (page 23 of Supps)
  - TS251 CMA 47 Questions covering Unit 12 only (pp.14-16 of Assignment Book)

  Your task is to decide whether and how each of these assignments could be improved. Consider both the content of the questions (eg difficulty, coverage of the objectives, ...) and how they are put.

Further Resources (optional use only):

- Consideration of TS251 TMA 03 which covers a case study similar to our own Car Body one (p.20 of Assignment Book).

- Roger Harrison — Can We Make Better Use of Objectives?

- _____ — Sample TMA scripts from T100 (set yourself the optional task of mentally grading and commenting on each one)

- Adrian Kirkwood — Tutor-Marked Assignments in Technology

- C J Byrne — Rules and Tests for Identifying Faults in Multiple Choice Test Items

- C J Byrne — Exercises: Checking Multiple Choice Test Items

TECHNOLOGY FACULTY INDUCTION PROGRAM

AUTUMN 1977

WORKSHOP ON COURSE DESIGN

This workshop will not be centred on any given course, but will hopefully bring together experience from many.

Preparation:

- Take the course you are currently working on and globally evaluate the following aspects of it:

  1. Its global structure (theoretical units, case studies, etc.)
  2. Its use of broadcasting (TV and radio)
  3. Home experiments and project (if any)
  4. Its procedures for collecting feedback.

  You will be expected to briefly describe these aspects of your course to others at the workshop.

- If you can manage it, have a look at how one or two other courses have dealt with the four aspects of course design listed above.

Resources (optional use):

• Methods Review Group	Interim Report (Technology)
• _____	Criteria and Guidelines for the Allocation of Broadcasts
• F. Berrigan	Preliminary Notes on Student Use of Broadcasts
• Anne Gibson	Classification and Examples of OU Broadcast Notes
• _____	Radio-Vision Example
• Jane Henry	A Study of Project Work at the OU
• R. McCormick	The Evaluation of OU Course Materials

idea, for the contrast between the units did play a major role in the discussion. Student feedback on one of the units was available and that was also found informative, even though it was intentionally presented to the group only at the end of the session so as not to unduly curb the discussion.

The second and third workshops followed a similar pattern. The second one, on objectives and assessment (cf. memo p. 13), was certainly the most popular of the workshops with a total of fourteen people round the table. This was due in part to a few part-time people who had decided to join in. The discussion was again very lively, with about half of it spent on objectives. Few hard and fast procedures were provided; rather, a great number of issues were raised and discussed.

The third workshop was the least well attended (only three group members; eight people in all), although this was partly due to a conflicting meeting in one of the disciplines. This session was also felt to be the least successful of the three, possibly because it was not focused on specific cases.

Visits phase. The intent of the visits organised in October was twofold: (i) to enable the new lecturers to get to know representatives from allied areas of the University, and (ii) to introduce them to the work of these areas, especially in how it may concern the new lecturers in their own future work.

The BBC visit was popular and felt to be very successful. Among other things, an opportunity was provided for viewing brief extracts from a collection of OU programmes in technology and for sitting in on the taping of a programme.

The regional visit had initially been planned to include an evening session at a study centre (sitting in on a foundation course tutorial) but this was later dropped from the programme, because by then tutorials had finished for the year. The regional visit simply consisted then in an informal briefing by a technology staff tutor and was followed by a tour of the Oxford Research Unit, this addition having been specifically requested earlier on by some of the group members.

The brief Walton Hall visits, as the regional visit, appealed to only three or four group members, although these were satisfied with the arrangements.

Finally, the open seminar planned for the end of the month was not held at that time. In conducting debriefing interviews with the group members, they were asked which topics they would like to suggest for further seminars, both for them as new lecturers and for the Faculty as a whole. Responses were very varied.

Course team visits. The intent of the course team visits scheme was to broaden the scope of one's early experience with the OU, ie essentially to see how others operate in disciplines other than one's own. The scheme consisted of making the necessary arrangements with the course assistants of all the Faculty's current courses in production and then simply notifying the group members of the dates of upcoming course team meetings. This was done by periodically updating the schedule (cf. memo p. 17) and distributing around. Few new lecturers, however, took advantage of the scheme.

Evaluation

An attempt was made to evaluate the induction programme by one or the other of us interviewing each of the new members of staff who took part. The interviews were free-ranging, but based on the following questions.

1. Which activities in the programme did you find most worthwhile?
2. Which activities did you find least worthwhile?
3. What happened at Alexandra Palace, during the regional visit and the Walton Hall visits?
4. Did you attend any course team meetings? If not, why not?
5. How could the induction programme be improved for the future?
6. Is there anything more which you would like arranged for your own induction?

TECHNOLOGY COURSE TEAM MEETINGS
SEPTEMBER & OCTOBER 1977
Sheet 2, dated 15 September

		Course	Course Assistant	Next Meeting
1978	T391	Control Engineering	Mr R. Dobson (3947)	29 Sept (10.00 a.m.)
	T273	Food Production Systems	Ms Judy Anderson (3674)	Soon
	T361	Control of Technology	Mr E. Taylor (3716)	23 Sept (11.00 a.m.)
1979	T352	Materials Processing	Mr R. Harris (3385)	Late September
	T232	Introduction to Solid Mechanics	Mr R. Dobson (3947)	22 Sept (10.00 a.m.)
	T401	Technology Project	[Mr A. Spackman (3941)]	?
1980	T101	Remake of T100	Mr S. Brown (3433)	28 Sept (2.00 p.m.)
	T283	Remake of TS282	Dr A. Dolan (3698)	Quite soon
	T243	Remake of T241	Mr C. Pym (3664)	End of October

Procedure: If you are interested in sitting-in on a course team meeting, simply call up the course assistant (or the chairman) to say you would like to attend (they have all agreed to this), and to ask him where the meeting will be held (and any other information you may want on the meeting).

7. What didn't you take part in, and why? Was it because you were unable to attend or did not consider it would be of any great interest?

There were also interviews with two of the mentors.

The overwhelming impression we received from these interviews is that the induction programme was successful and was appreciated by the new members who took part. Although some activities were considered to be more valuable than others, none were considered to be of no value to anyone, or to have been in any sense disastrous failures. The visit to the BBC probably just about topped the list, followed very closely by the first two workshops. Andrew Spackman's talk on general faculty matters was also widely appreciated.

The visit to the regional office was generally considered to be of only limited value, although the opportunity to visit the Oxford Research Centre was appreciated. It was unfortunate that the visit came too late to enable the new members to visit a study centre in operation. Had it been arranged earlier, when the study centres were still active, it might have been more valuable. The tour round the campus to visit various sections also seems to have been only partially successful, and should probably not be repeated in quite the same form.

The timing of the programme was not ideal for all concerned. It came too late for some who had already been around long enough to find their way around before the initial sessions were arranged. It was perhaps too abrupt a beginning for those who arrived late. There seems to have been a little difficulty in one or two cases in getting information about the induction programme to new members of staff at the right time. Although the programme had been timed to coincide with the arrival of the majority of the new members of staff, some of them had already got tied up with other activities and were unable to attend some or all of the sessions. A few of those involved referred to a conflict of priorities

which affected particularly those on part-time or short-term contracts.

Practically all those involved welcomed the opportunity of meeting and discussing with people in other disciplines and would have liked this to be extended to those in other faculties. Opinion was more divided on the question of whether the workshops should be based on units with a wide general appeal, or whether it would be more profitable to split up into small discipline-based groups. Majority opinion appears to be that it is fruitful to hold general discussions.

There was universal agreement that an induction programme is valuable for newcomers and that some form of induction programme should be made available to all new recruits. The general opinion seems to be that it should be rather more concentrated than the present programme, but not to the extent that those taking part would find it difficult to assimilate all the ideas being presented. It looks as though an early orientation experience designed to help people find their way about the campus, know who's who and what's what, would be useful as soon as possible after the new recruit arrives on campus. Discussion of educational issues might profitably be postponed for a month or so until the newcomer has had time to settle down. A month or two after arrival there should be a fairly concentrated programme spread over about two weeks, consisting of workshops, visits to the BBC and so on. Every effort should be made to keep the inductee clear of other commitments during this period and the general opinion seemed to be that the experience is sufficiently valuable to justify newcomers being strongly advised to attend. It was also felt that experienced members of the faculty should also be asked to set aside time during this period to enable them to take an active part in the induction programme. Most of those who took part in the induction programme would have welcomed more documentation, provided that it is not too bulky. In a number of instances it was felt that a document that could be studied at leisure might have been more suitable than a meeting.

The reason that this was not done of course is partly that suitable documents do not yet exist.

Some Specific Suggestions

A number of specific suggestions were made during the course of the interviews and are listed here as being possibly worth implementation at some time in the future.

1. There should be a glossary of OU terminology prepared for newcomers.
2. There should be a "Who's Who" prepared for Open University staff.
3. There should be a handbook for new staff members. This might presumably cover 1. and 2. above as well as other matters.
4. Instead of arranging formal visits to the various sections of the OU, it might be possible to issue new members of staff with a list of heads of sections (or their deputies) who would be prepared to receive inductees in order to explain the working of their unit. It would then be up to the inductee to make his own arrangements to meet the person concerned.
5. There should be a guide to OU course units which would indicate their relative strengths and weaknesses and main characteristics, so that people would know which units to look at in order to get some idea of the various styles of presentation which have been tried.
6. It would be useful to the Technology Faculty to invite one or two industrialists to discuss how the OU can contribute to the education and training of their personnel.
7. There should be a discussion on future trends and possibilities for the OU in the 1980's.
8. It would be valuable to invite the original unit authors to any discussions on the structure of their unit.

9. It would encourage attendance and help to establish esprit de corps if inductees and their mentors could take refreshment together, at least at the beginning of the induction programme.

10. Most inductees would appreciate an opportunity for an informal meeting with the Dean and possibly with the VC and other University officers.

11. A one or two day visit to a summer school is a useful induction experience.

12. Regular seminars on educational issues and on matters of particular concern, such as HEKs, would be valuable.

Recommendations for Future Induction Courses

In the light of experience with this induction programme and its evaluation, we recommend the following.

1. Every effort should be made to provide an induction experience for all new members of the academic staff, but this should be done so far as possible on a University rather than a Faculty basis.

2. The arrangements should be made jointly by IET, Personnel Division and each of the faculties involved.

3. The programme should be broadly similar to the one outlined above.

4. As soon as possible, additional documents should be written which are suitable for handing out to newcomers to cover as much as possible of the actual content of the induction programme.

5. The programme should be in two parts. As soon as possible after arrival the inductee should be given a personally conducted tour of the campus and sufficient information to enable him to find his bearings. A month or two after his arrival, or as soon as sufficient new members are in post, he should be strongly

encouraged to take part in a fairly intensive induction programme consisting of discussions, workshops and talks by appropriate section leaders dealing with the major issues involved in the production of OU courses.

5. Each inductee should be assigned to a mentor in his own discipline who would be responsible for ensuring that he received an appropriate induction experience tailored to his own particular needs. The mentor would be responsible for making sure that the general induction programme which was available for new members of staff in all disciplines, is supplemented where necessary by discipline-specific items.

COURSE DEVELOPMENT GROUP PAPERS

CD1 NOTES ON THE EARLY STAGES OF COURSE PLANNING
by Philippe Duchastel, Roger Harrison, Euan Henderson, Barbara Hodgson, Adrian Kirkwood, Robert Zimmer

CD2 HOW TO USE CONSULTANTS SUCCESSFULLY
by Judith Riley

CD3 DISCUSSING AND EVALUATING DRAFTS
by Judith Riley

CD4 ASSESSMENT
by Judith Riley

CD5 INTRODUCING NEW FACULTY MEMBERS TO COURSE PRODUCTION
by Philippe Duchastel and Roger Harrison